

	<p>Consultation</p>
<p>PERFORMANCE DATA FRAMEWORK FOR LEAS</p> <p>The purpose of this consultation is to gather views on the draft document, Performance Data Framework for LEAs. This document sets out the principles and good practice which LEAs are recommended to follow to ensure that all schools receive a comprehensive range of quality performance data.</p> <p>Please email/post response forms, by 18 July 2003, to: Consultation Unit, Level 1, Area B, Castle View House, East Lane, Runcorn WA7 2GJ or dataframework.consultation@dfes.gsi.gov.uk</p> <p>Further information Policy enquiries to: Sameea Ahmed, Pupil Performance Team, DfES, Sanctuary Buildings, Great Smith Street, Westminster, London, SW1P 3BT Tel 020 7925 5894. E-mail: sameea.ahmed@dfes.gsi.gov.uk</p> <p>department for education and skills</p>	<p>LEAs National Association of Education Inspectors, Advisers and Consultants (NAEIAC) Teacher Associations Local Government Association (LGA) Confederation of Education Service Managers (CONFED) Association for Achievement and Improvement through Assessment (AAIA) National Consortium for Examination Results (NCER) Society of Education Officers Society of Chief Inspectors and Advisers (SCIA) Audit Commission (AC) Improvement and Development Agency (IDeA) National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) OFSTED QCA The Education Network (TEN) Virtual Staff College (VSC) National College of School Leadership</p> <p>Date of issue: 04/06/2003</p> <p>Closing Date: 18/07/03</p>

Executive Summary

1. The analysis of pupil performance data is an important element in the school improvement process. Many LEAs provide such information to schools, but although there is some good practice, the overall quality does vary. All LEAs would benefit from guidance on the scope and quality of data they should be providing.
2. The Data Standards Framework sets out the principles and good practice which Local Education Authorities (LEAs) are recommended to follow to ensure that all schools receive a comprehensive range of quality performance data which they can use to support self-evaluation and raise standards.
3. The framework will have two significant outcomes. Firstly it will establish a consistency between the Department, LEAs, schools, Ofsted and QCA in using performance data for the purposes of accountability, and assessment for learning. Secondly, it will raise the overall quality of the data schools receive through the emphasis on ease of data interpretation and analysis.
4. The framework provides the basis on which LEAs can ensure that all their local schools receive performance data that compares schools and pupils against the national data made available in the Autumn Package, in addition to any locally provided supplementary analysis.
5. The framework does not prescribe how data should be provided to schools, but expects it will include a mixture of interactive on-line systems, on-line paper files, and printed performance packs. Nor does the framework prescribe precisely how data is presented, what data is included, and how data is used.
6. The framework clarifies respective roles and responsibilities to ensure that all schools receive a minimum agreed level of data against which to set performance and curricular targets. It should not limit LEAs, who are encouraged to work beyond the required minimum.

Background

7. Schools already have a considerable amount of helpful performance data on their pupils in their own Management Information Systems. However, they also require timely externally provided comparative data to:
 - inform their curriculum planning and pupil target setting;
 - evaluate their strengths and weaknesses;
 - raise expectations and change teaching and learning;
 - identify where improvement has taken place and where performance is better than expected.
8. At present Ofsted, and Local Education Authorities provide external data, that use the Autumn Package supplied by the Department.

9. The Autumn Package provides a national standard for performance data, enabling schools to analyse their overall performance against national trends, to make comparisons against similar schools, and examine the progress made by pupils. However, creating the analysis can be time consuming for schools without adequate Management Information Systems. Therefore, the Department also supports the Interactive Autumn Package, which allows schools to transfer their data from their Management Information System to carry out analyses, particularly using value added data.
10. Ofsted provide each school with a PANDA containing an analysis and interpretation of their overall performance data and the facility to see the effect of changes in their pupil profile or performance on the benchmark tables.
11. Further still, schools typically receive from their LEA a more detailed analysis of their performance data against local and national standards, often interpreting the Autumn Package. LEAs also use performance data strategically to intervene and support schools.
12. At present each LEA decides what data to send to schools, and when it will be provided. However there is little guidance for LEAs, and while there is much good practice, all LEAs would benefit from a set of standards against which to judge their data provision, while schools need to know what range and quality of data they might expect to receive.

Co-ordination of data provision

13. The Department recently undertook a review of the Autumn Package and the provision of data to schools. The review had two main conclusions. Firstly, it recommended that a data standards framework was necessary because externally provided data:
 - varied in quality;
 - was not always timely for schools;
 - suffered from duplication;
 - and because different organisations are unclear as to what each would provide.Secondly, the review recommended that LEAs provided schools with an analysis of performance using national and local data, subject to a framework of minimum data standards to enhance consistency and quality.
14. The aims of the framework are to:
 - ensure high quality data by specifying a set of standards;
 - encourage, subject to the national data collection process, early provision of data

- in the Autumn term, so that it is timely for schools;
- reduce duplication of data provided to schools;
- clarify the roles of the Department, Ofsted and LEAs, and co-ordinate their work for the benefit of schools.

15. LEAs are well placed to provide data analysis to schools, as they:

- all collect Key Stage 1 data directly from schools;
- all have access to Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3 National Curriculum data in the datafeeds from QCA;
- all subscribe to GCSE and A-level data from the University of Bath;
- all have access to matched pupil data in the National Pupil Database (NPD) for the pupils on roll in January against which they can match in the results of pupils each Summer.
- All have access to Key To Success, especially in terms of providing Key Stage 2 data for the Year 7 pupils who have moved into an LEA.

In addition, many LEAs collect additional pupil performance data from schools for non-statutory testing. LEAs also have the freedom to innovate, and many have a trusting relationship with schools allowing them to use early, but provisional data.

16. The framework has clear lines of responsibility. The Department will provide national data in standard formats to a published timetable, and will inform LEAs about the types of national data to be made available. LEAs will inform schools what types of data they will provide, in what formats, and to a locally agreed timetable.

Your views

Q1. Do you agree LEAs should provide each school with an interpretation of their data compared against other local schools on the same basis as in the Autumn Package?

Q2. Do you agree that a timetable is sufficient to ensure co-ordination between the Department and LEAs?

Framework

17. The framework is a set of good practice principles for the provision of performance data to schools, and covers:

- Use of data, and data analyses by schools
- Data techniques to be used
- Presentation of performance data

- Access and delivery

These principles are illustrated with examples in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 (which can be downloaded separately)

Use of data, and data analyses by schools

18. Performance data to schools must be for the purposes of:
 - **Reviewing achievement:** data should inform a process of annual review, looking at how pupils have achieved compared to national standards and those in similar schools, and how the School Development Plan should take account of the priorities of the school.
 - **Supporting and enhancing teaching and learning:** data should enable schools to examine the progress pupils have made and their strengths and weaknesses in ways which inform future teaching and learning, and also help identify good practice.
 - **Informing future curriculum planning, including target setting:** data should be part of a process of future planning, where the school analyses its strengths and weaknesses in achievement and progress, and develops its objectives and requirements in the School Development Plan.
19. Local Education Authorities should ensure that schools are able to use the data they have to inform teaching and learning in the classroom, such as by providing advice, offering training, or pointing schools towards publications. Local Education Authorities should also ensure that advisers and link inspectors are well informed and competent in the use of the data, and use it in challenging and supportive discussions with schools. They should take into account the use of performance aspects of the National Standards for School Improvement Professionals.

Your views

- Q3. **Do you agree that these three principles sufficiently inform the types of data that should be provided to schools?**

Data techniques

20. Schools require a range of performance data to fully understand their strengths and weaknesses, and are expected to use all data honestly and critically. The range should include (in alphabetical order):

- **Comparative data:** Schools need data that compares different subjects e.g. English against Maths against Science, indicating which subjects are weak or strong. To put this in perspective, they also need this data presented over time.
- **Progress (value-added) data:** Schools need to use value-added data as a diagnostic tool, especially when trying to identify whether the school is underachieving, and which pupils are underachieving, compared to current national standards. Ideally, schools require electronic access to this data, because of the many different cohorts of pupils they may wish to analyse, some of which are part of standard datasets (e.g. ethnic origin), some of which are not (e.g. booster classes, Excellence in Cities Initiatives).
- **School-Level Benchmarks:** Schools need their performance benchmarked against similar schools. Currently schools are benchmarked using free school meal benchmarks, prior attainment benchmarks and in some instances by type of school (e.g. Secondary Modern) which judge performance differently. Free school meal benchmarks provide a comparison of achievement based on levels of social deprivation. Prior attainment benchmarks allow schools to compare pupil progress with other schools of a similar intake. Data providers should make use of some type of benchmark data, but if using both, they should explain to schools why Free School Meal benchmarks and prior attainment benchmarks may provide different judgements, and how the different benchmarks should be used. The analyses should enable schools to compare themselves in particular with higher performing similar schools.
- **Target setting:** Estimates of likely progress of individual pupils and cohorts of pupils based on prior attainment, and used to inform school target setting. Ideally this information should be available electronically for inclusion in school management information systems, ready for moderation.
- **Trend data:** Trend data for groups of pupils (e.g. ethnic origin) showing results over time, but also having some comparative expectations or results to put the school's data in perspective.

At present, the Autumn Package provides LEAs and schools with the national data to calculate benchmarks, and value-added lines for progress data. Progress charts and value-added data in the Autumn Package can also be used to establish targets for pupils.

Your views

- Q4. Do you agree that all the types of data can be provided by LEAs to schools?**
- Q5. Do LEAs require any additional national data to enable them to provide interpretations and analysis to schools?**

Presentation

21. Data has to be accessible to a range of audiences within a school, and must make explicit the achievement issues. The principles for the quality of the data schools receive covers (in alphabetical order):
- **Commentary:** data providers should supply a strategic commentary about the achievement issues within the LEA, so that schools understand where their achievement issues fit with the LEA's strategic priorities, and the resources made available for them. The commentary should also interpret the implications of national and local targets for schools.
 - **Detail:** as some levels encompass a broad range of marks, data providers should use, where relevant, analysis using a breakdown of results into smaller units. Sub-levels of a, b and c are used by QCA in the Optional and Year 7 Progress Tests. The National Consortium for Examination Results (NCER) Keypas software calculates a, b and c sub-levels from the marks at Key Stages 2 and 3. It is recommended that LEAs also use that subdivision in their analyses.
 - **Lucidity:** all school staff should be able to look at a set of data and recognise things from it about the school. They should not have to piece together a picture from lots of different sources. Therefore data should be brought together, where possible, instead of spread over different pages. For example, to give an analysis of English, Maths and Science on one page, instead of three pages. Data should also draw attention to the significant issues, such as by highlighting major differences, or the extremes.
 - **Quality and usability:** data must be accompanied by documentation and guidance, such as having short notes on the page itself about interpretation, in addition to more detailed notes elsewhere. Guidance should include both a question-based focus to assist school self-evaluation, as well as technical notes about the sources of the data, its reliability, the effect of small cohorts on the figures etc.
 - **Quantity:** schools should receive a manageable amount of data that is provided for the purposes stated earlier.
 - **Sharing school data:** Data providers need to take a decision in agreement with their schools whether to provide data for other named schools within the locality in order to: reinforce local issues; illuminate comparative benchmark data with named local schools; share good practice. Data providers also need to consider what the locality is. Small LEAs may wish to provide data from other schools outside the LEA, while large LEAs may wish to share data within smaller geographical areas, and not the whole LEA.

Your views

- Q6. Do you agree that these principles cover the full range of supplementary**

information required by schools?

Access and delivery

22. Schools need to know when to expect data, and when to provide data. LEAs should establish a timetable with schools for the provision of performance data, so schools know what to expect, when to expect it, and which fits in with their own planning timetable. LEAs should decide whether they wish to provide early, provisional data to schools for use early in the Autumn Term and ahead of the national Autumn Package data, or whether to wait until later in the Autumn term, and issue more complete, or even finalised data. Ofsted will provide finalised data in the PANDA, and LEAs that have issued early data, may wish to consider making finalised data available on-line for schools in case schools require it.
23. The Department will establish an Autumn Package timetable to keep LEAs and software providers informed about timescales and content of the national data.
24. Data providers also need to ensure that data is accessible to the different audiences, and is tailored for their different needs. Such audiences will include:
 - Headteachers
 - Classroom teachers
 - Governors
 - Senior Management Team
 - Heads of Department
 - LEA Advisers
 - LEA Strategists
 - Clusters of schools (e.g. Education Action Zones)

Schools are responsible for providing pupil-level information to parents and pupils.

25. Local Education Authorities should be aware that schools ought to have electronic access to documents and information. Whether access is ensured through electronic documents or software should be left to the discretion of providers.

Your views

- Q7. Do you agree with the audiences for performance data and the need for LEAs to communicate how and when they will provide data to schools?**

Methodology

26. A variety of methods are available for analysing and interpreting data. For

example, different value-added measures are currently in use:

- Performance Table Value Added Measure – used in the Secondary School Performance Tables from 2002, where individual pupils' average points scores are used as inputs and outputs and compared to a national median line
- Prior Attainment Benchmarks – compares schools with a group of similar schools using prior attainment, but there can be significant differences between benchmark tables, leading to schools finding that the benchmarks from two adjacent tables can result in different judgements of performance.
- Comparing actual against expected results – as used by the Fischer Family Trust for example. Estimates are calculated from pupils' prior attainment, and aggregated to produce an estimate figure or range for the school, against which actual attainment can be measured.
- Differences – a progress measure, rather than a value-added measure, used by some LEAs, which takes the difference between the % of pupils achieving a level at one Key Stage, and the previous stage, and compares this difference with that for the LEA.
- Value-added graphs – an opportunity to measure the progress of individual pupils against the national upper quartile, median and lower quartile.

The methods differ according to whether the intended audience requires diagnostic information (e.g. the value-added graphs), a measure of overall performance (e.g. prior attainment benchmarks or the performance table measure), or to compare a number of schools (e.g. comparing actual results against expected results). LEAs should make clear the characteristics of the methodology used and their purposes and implications.

27. Trend and comparative data for small schools should be treated with due care as each child is worth a significant percentage of the overall results, and therefore trends are likely to be more variable, possibly resulting in benchmark interpretations differing significantly from one year to the next. However, small schools should still make use of comparative data. For example, if a school's results were consistent over time, then this is probably a good indication of school effectiveness, and cannot be dismissed on methodological grounds. Secondly, pupil-level value-added data is a reliable measure of progress, and is unaffected by school size.

Future of the Data Standards Framework

28. The Data Standards Framework uses examples and specifies techniques based on the minimum range of data available to all LEAs in 2002. LEAs may have other assessment data they will want to examine in light of the framework, such

as Optional Tests or Cognitive Ability Tests. The Framework will need constant revision to take account of new types of data analyses, for example achievement matched to PLASC data, P-Scales, the new Foundation Stage, and question-level analysis of National Curriculum tests. It will also need revision to take account of new policy developments, such as 14-19 provision.

29. The Data Standards Framework has a very specific focus upon pupil and school attainment data, but the approach should also be used by LEAs with the other performance data they provide to schools for self-evaluation purposes, such as financial data, attendance rates, exclusion figures, post 16 staying on rates, and early years places. LEAs should also be highlighting the inter-relationship between these, such as by looking at the effect of non-attendance on levels of attainment.

Implementation timetable for the Data Standards Framework

30. Following consultation, the final framework will be published later in 2003. The Framework is not a statutory document, but all LEAs will be encouraged to review their performance data provision to schools, and to begin implementing as soon as possible.

How to respond

31. Questions appear throughout the body of the document. To give your response, please use the separate 'Consultation Response Form'.

Please send your completed response form to:
Consultation Unit, Level 1, Area B, Castle View House, East Lane, Runcorn
WA7 2GJ or by email to: dataframework.consultation@dfes.gsi.gov.uk

Enquiries about policy issues should be addressed to:
Sameea Ahmed, Pupil Performance Team, DfES, Sanctuary Buildings, Great
Smith Street, Westminster, London, SW1P 3BT
Tel 020 7925 5894.
E-mail: sameea.ahmed@dfes.gsi.gov.uk

Additional Copies

32. If you require a large print, Braille or audio version, please contact Sameea Ahmed at the above address.

Plans for making results public

33. We will attempt to incorporate your comments where possible. Please note that it will not always be possible to incorporate all your comments. A summary of comments from the consultation will be available on www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations from August 2003.

Appendix 1: Illustrative set of data

The example pages are intended to demonstrate how the data standards could be interpreted by an LEA to provide a set of analytical data for a school, and are as much a part of the framework as the principles. To exemplify the range of techniques available, tables 1 to 6 illustrate how benchmark data can be presented in different ways depending on the audience and their data interpretation skills.

The following notes explain:

- The justification/rationale for each page
- Any necessary technical notes needed for an explanation

Tables 1 and 2

Value-added graphs at a pupil-level, supported by a list of named pupils in Table 9 listed in point score/average level order, so it is possible to identify the individual dots.

Can present the data either using an average point score as per the Autumn Package, or an average level which is derived by dividing the average points score by six. The average level has the advantage of being slightly more understandable by a school audience, and doesn't require vertical guidelines to show the level ranges.

Here two data series are shown, but these can only be told apart on close examination, so that the overall picture is clear.

A fine point score is used in these tables. Officially, point scores are awarded for whole levels e.g. a Level 4 is given a point score of 27. However, as each Level covers a six point range, it is possible to sub-divide levels into three e.g. 4A, 4B, 4C, and also to sub-divide into 6, so that each point is worth 1/6th of the marks available for the Level. Hence a Level 4 is worth between 25 and 30 marks inclusive depending on the marks awarded.

The progress measure in Table 9 is simply the difference between the previous Key Stage average point score/level, and the current Key Stage subject point score/level. While factually correct, any interpretation of these figures has to be viewed with care, because pupils could be expected to make different rates of progress depending on their prior attainment. In this example, the extremes of progress are highlighted, but there isn't a judgement about how progress compares to expectations.

Table 3

Comparison against named local schools (could be within an LEA, or geographical area) deemed to be similar either by Free School Meals or Prior Attainment. Each list is ordered by attainment, while the named school is highlighted. This is a good way of bringing benchmarks to life in a simple, non-technical way, as a school can compare its position against others.

Table 4

Trend graphs show differences over time, but there should also be a comparator to know if the difference is significant.

These charts show trends for males, females and the school overall, while the national interquartile range based on the school's FSM is illustrated by the 'whiskers'. This table therefore shows trends over time, gender differences, and how the school compares to similar schools.

Table 5

A collection of benchmarks, but includes the interpretation of the A*-E* column headings. Allows a school to judge where its comparative strengths and weaknesses are across the different subjects and measures.

Table 6

A page bringing together a school's benchmarks over time, putting its results into context. For example, are results rising, but the school's benchmark grading is unchanged.

Table 7

Graph showing a group of schools (the whole LEA, or a benchmark group depending on the number of schools) together with results and FSM benchmark bands.

Table 8

Graph showing a group of schools (the whole LEA, or a benchmark group depending on the number of schools) together with results and Prior Attainment benchmark bands.

Table 9

Graphs allowing a comparison between subjects (English, Maths and Science), but also comparing outcomes against potential, using lower quartile and upper quartile figures derived from prior attainment data.

Table 10

Target setting data for current cohorts. Could use percentage chances, or target ranges as in this example. Final column provides the cumulative percentage of pupils in the school, to help set targets.